

Interim Evaluation of the Southeastern Regional Vision for Education

I. Brief Overview of Laboratory

The SERVE Laboratory has a brief history dating back to 1990. The panel conducting the Interim evaluation of the Lab first reviewed extensive written documentation and then visited the Lab to conduct intensive interviews over five days, May 10-14, 1999. Combined with the written documentation, the five days of interviews illuminated major initiatives at the Lab. Sufficient documentation and insights were provided to address the key evaluation questions presented by OERI. A special note of recognition and thanks is due Decision Information Resources, Inc. which made strategic decisions in arranging materials and hosting the on-site visit.

II. Implementation and Management

A. To what extent is the REL doing what they were approved to do during their first three contract years?

1. Strengths

SERVE appears to be performing adequately to above expectations in attaining goals of the original proposal, with modifications, except for some insufficient emphasis on national publications.

During a period of transition in the position of Executive Director, SERVE has profited from the continuous leadership of a highly involved Board of Directors. In a convincing manner the current Director and the Board agree as one that the mission of the REL is coterminous with the mission of SERVE. In practice this means that educational priorities consistent with SERVE's contractual obligations to OERI are first established, then decisions regarding the

allocation of resources from throughout SERVE are made to address the missions identified. The new Executive Director observed that, “Throughout the history of SERVE, the operation of the Regional Educational Laboratory (REL) contract has been its core business. That is, all other programs and projects undertaken by SERVE must complement its work as the REL serving AL, FL, GA, MS, NC, and SC.”

An interview with the Executive Committee of SERVE’s Board of Directors provided remarkable insights and understanding of SERVE initiatives which could only result from intimate knowledge and understanding. On the Board as well as its advisory committees, there appear to be sufficient and balanced representation from all expected constituencies, including teachers, administrators, students, parents, policymakers, higher education, and state education departments. Board members uniformly praised SERVE for the sensitive manner in which needs of the region were reflected in finely tailored educational initiatives. In several respects they attributed distinctive qualities to SERVE initiatives in the region: introducing “best practices” from other parts of the nation, and serving as an objective and neutral observer for policymakers on controversial issues. As one Board member phrased it, “SERVE is the expert, not the advocate.”

In a unique on-site arrangement among the RELs, SERVE’s Policy Analysts occupy a special relationship as advisors to the Chief State School Officer (CSSO) in each of the six states. All have doctorates and research backgrounds. As they network with each other, interact with program officers, and participate in SERVE’s QA process, their views and influence pervade many aspects of the organization. Their role is reactive, responding to requests from CSSOs, legislators, and other policymakers; and also proactive, as they serve on pivotal committees and maintain key relationships which allow them to help shape policy agendas. This

structure has been especially successful in affording SERVE a continuous presence and identity in state policy circles, while serving as a conduit of information regarding evolving policy priorities within and across the states. The Policy Analysts view their role as that of providing pros and cons on issues in a dispassionate way. Instructively and significantly, the policymakers whom the review panel interviewed view the role of Policy Analysts in the same manner.

Relating sensitively to needs of the region is a considerable strength of SERVE. Some of the Review Panel's concern about SERVE's insufficient enthusiasm for seeking a national influence and reputation is explained in part by the priority given to addressing needs of the region. The networks and partnerships which SERVE has established within the region, both formal and informal, are so ubiquitous that they defy easy description or definition.

There are bright spots regarding SERVE's national presence, such as involvement of the Assessment, Accountability, and Evaluation staff in activities of ASCD and AERA, and the national recognition received for selected publications, such as the National Staff Development Council recognizing the SERVE publication, Achieving Your Vision of Professional Development, as Book of the Year; and presentations by the Early Childhood unit at national meetings, including the NAEYC. Due to the overriding emphasis on publications for the region, however, the potential value of disseminating nationally useful findings has not been fully realized.

A high degree of customer satisfaction was noted in surveys, attendance at meetings, website hits, and diverse interviews with users. Independent evaluations of customer satisfaction, however, were not available.

There is considerable evidence of SERVE's effective partnering with other labs and

external organizations, including: leveraging of non-Lab resources to support each Lab program; interactivity with other labs in regard to the assessment Toolkit; uses of the LNP to disseminate Early Childhood findings; CSRD lab coordinator meetings, information dissemination efforts, and the sharing of resources; and coordination of resources from School Improvement and the Eisenhower Consortium in the Mississippi Delta.

Through its program activities, SERVE is addressing significant issues in educational change and reform throughout the region. Focus on the signature initiative of Assessment Accountability, and Evaluation reflects the emphasis throughout the southeast on school reform which holds schools accountable for student achievement. The SERVE staff correctly perceives the opportunity and need to provide relevant professional development for teachers and administrators in order for the southeastern states to realize their goals.

The signature area of School Improvement similarly addresses specific needs of the region, evolving initially from a single request from the state of Georgia that expanded to 104 schools in that state. The principal focus has been on the transition of Title I schools to school-wide reform. On-site interviews with staff and clients added considerably to understanding SERVE's approach to school improvement as a hands-on, interactive, enabling process predicated on "whole school" planning. The SERVE staff provides reform-based ideas centered on planning needs which schools identify. The actual reforms, whether within the school, classroom, or community, are left for local participants to implement.

The staff reported significant increases in reading scores at several schools after a few years of involvement in the school improvement process. It was rewarding to learn that the more recent efforts in reading are being coordinated with overall professional development for the schools on one hand, and with SERVE's specialty in Early Childhood on the other. Further

study, presumably, will address the issue of attribution. Even in school settings which are difficult to reform, with local support the SERVE staff persist in the effort.

SERVE's Office of School Development and Reform houses other initiatives which are complementary to the School Development program: CSR, the Annual Forum, the Delta Project, and the Southern Seminar on Low Performing Schools.

Since many of SERVE's programs operate primarily in single states, the seminal work in helping to launch the CSRD initiative is distinguished by its region-wide scope. From providing appropriate knowledge, to assisting prospective implementation and evaluation, SERVE has guided SEAs, LEAs, and policymakers each step of the way. It is difficult to imagine a major CSRD need left unaddressed in a manner friendly to users.

The Annual Forum is a major annual SERVE event, engaging stakeholders from across the six-state region. Preparation for the Forum is an important internal process for SERVE since staff across the major program areas are engaged; similarly, the agenda for the Forum provides regionwide opportunities for users to interact and collaborate as they learn more regarding SERVE's diverse initiatives. The Forum also serves as an opportunity for representatives to help shape SERVE's agenda consistent with evolving local needs. Surveys have generally reported high ratings by participants.

SERVE has long-standing interests and broader aspirations in the Mississippi Delta area. A close alliance has been established across several SERVE programs, including School Improvement, Early Childhood, SEIR-TEC, and the Eisenhower Consortium. A recent conference between SERVE representatives, Delta State University, and other Delta stakeholders produced concurrence that SERVE could impact the area systematically by helping coalesce initiatives in reading, early childhood, and leadership training. SERVE is commended for

recognizing the need to address the systemic educational problems of the Delta in a systemic manner, and keeping open the opportunity for SERVE's Delta efforts to grow into a signature area. They recognize, however, that addressing the Delta systemically requires broader commitments within Mississippi and significant commitments from other sectors. An integrated multistate/federal/private approach is needed to leverage and integrate efforts to address the Delta's educational needs.

2. Areas of needed improvement

- **National Recognition, Research and Presentations.** There have apparently not been strong incentives historically from the central administration and some possible disincentives to publish in national journals and present at diverse national meetings. Nothing, however, should compromise SERVE's unmistakable and invaluable commitment to serve its region well. In doing so there are exemplary models and practices being developed which should be shared more broadly. For these stellar insights and activities, SERVE should define its "region" as the nation.
- **Internal Coordination and Collaboration Among Programs.** Cross-pollination of ideas which span programs occurs in a variety of ways: preparations for and planned activities at the annual Forum; special cross-program task forces; coordinating responsibilities of the Executive Director for Programs; diverse electronic communications; and an informal atmosphere which promotes friendly interchange. Nevertheless, SERVE has offices and personnel which embrace six states and many programs. Designing opportunities to ensure that the best insights from one systemic program informs the directions taken by another will be a constant challenge and responsibility for central management and staff at all levels.
- **Except for the notable exception of the CSRD initiative, many of SERVE's programs are unique to one or two states.** It is unclear whether programs and initiatives are apportioned across states in a balanced manner. This apportionment has direct implications for the upscaling of programs.
- **Need for Integrated Multistate/Multifederal agency/Private Delta Reform Initiative.** Notwithstanding SERVE's visionary efforts and aspirations, the overriding educational needs of the Delta extend beyond the capacity of a single governmental level, organization, or agency to address. Secretary of Education Richard Riley should exercise leadership in convening, with active support of Governors affected, a three-state conference on educational needs of the Delta. A proposal, based on a multistate study of resources and programs available, should then be made to the President and Congress.

3. Recommendations for improvement

- While sustaining its commendable traditional focus, SERVE should maintain a more balanced portfolio by providing greater incentives for selected staff to achieve higher levels of recognition for major programs through national presentations and publications in national journals.
- The central administration, within constraints of resources and time, should make certain that cross-pollination of key insights occurs through regular opportunities for effective staff interaction across programs.
- Considerable care should be taken to ensure that, given limitations of resources and varied needs, SERVE apportions reform initiatives across states in as balanced a manner as possible.

B. To what extent is the REL using a self-monitoring process to plan and adapt activities in response to feedback and customer needs?

1. Strengths

SERVE's current hierarchical organization, which requires reporting from line officers to managers by function, appears reasonable and prospectively effective. The previous organization, which required everyone to report to the Executive Director, was reported to be dysfunctional. The Director was overextended while communications with varied customers were impeded (see p.1).

SERVE's basic philosophy of self-monitoring is that internal checking, buttressed by targeted external review, is the primary key to quality. An abiding and strongly held view of the organization is that formal publications, SERVE's face to its many publics, is the critical locale where internal quality controls must be at their zenith. The review process has many hurdles for concepts to evolve and become major SERVE publications. Operating at its best, the highly effective process ensures that documents which survive have a reasonably strong research base. It is relevant to note that this procedure has produced attractive SERVE documents for dissemination, several of which have won national distinction.

SERVE's formal organization for monitoring its activities is reasonable and effective. Self-monitoring and feedback are common themes throughout surveys, studies, and reports. Considerable attention is given to developing programs on an interactive needs assessment basis. Indeed the current programmatic structure of SERVE reflects needs assessment through the Delphi process which involves diverse stakeholders, including Board members. The distributed organization to different sites, including roles of Policy Analysts, all contribute to self-monitoring. The QA process, as noted above, is the principal mode by which the entire organization monitors quality. The new hierarchical organizational structure, which clarifies lines of authority and responsibility, should strengthen the monitoring process. Review of documents and interviews with staff and customers revealed that single event monitoring, often through surveys, routinely takes place as a source of immediate feedback to on-site project staff.

It became abundantly clear during the review that SERVE, reflecting its sensitivity and commitment to serving the region, engages in a continuous process of monitoring in order to more effectively serve its diverse customers.

2. Areas of needed improvement

- SERVE needs to adopt a broader definition of "customer," to include, especially in key areas, a national as well as a regional audience.
- Coordinated monitoring across programs would allow SERVE to more effectively serve customers by broadening the range from which best practices could be adapted.

3. Recommendations for improvement

- Internal evaluation and studies are currently conducted by staff from SERVE's Evaluation unit on a part-time assigned basis. To afford greater credibility and visibility, SERVE may wish to arrange periodic external evaluations for selected signature areas.
- See also #2 above.

III. Quality

To what extent is the REL developing high quality products and services?

1. Strengths

Across its many programs and initiatives, the strengths of SERVE cannot be easily summarized. All of the documents and conversations, during diverse interviews, both with staff and a range of users, made clear SERVE's abiding dedication to advance teaching and learning within the context of the educational and cultural environment of the region. This commitment manifests itself in attitudes and understandings as well as more formal programs and initiatives. Outcomes are equally obvious and equally subtle.

Within the region, SERVE is generally developing products and services of unusually high quality. The Student Assessment in the School and Classroom initiative has been stimulated by increasing emphasis of southeastern states on accountability of low-performing students and schools. For this effort SERVE has used widely the assessment Toolkits developed and revised through the LNP program. Recognizing that testing is the pivot of accountability in all state accountability systems, SERVE has appropriately concentrated on professional development for teachers, with the focus on assessment as the prerequisite to helping these state reforms succeed.

With active sites in 9 districts, SERVE's Assessment initiative has directly impacted over 50 schools and 3,600 teachers. Resources for this initiative are derived both from REL and other sources. The principal goal is to help develop and institutionalize alternative assessments in selected schools and districts; then use these as a base for upscaling. By tailoring approaches to local circumstances through a user friendly interactive process, districts, schools, and teachers involved gain ownership and empowerment. This is a dominant feature of the effort.

There is an interesting balance which the staff has reached regarding scholarly research and field-based research which is published only internally. National research informs many directions taken, yet this research separated from practice is clearly not the highest priority. Precedence is given to the evolution of field-based experiences which decisively shapes directions taken. The recognitions given SERVE's assessment publications and program leaders by ASCD and AERA are testaments to an even broader national value of this initiative.

The Senior Project is a way of extending alternative assessment to the high school level through exiting projects for 12th graders. The Senior Project has clearly had dramatic results at a variety of sites in North Carolina, as well as other selected sites, most notably Panama City, Florida. It became clear through interviews with about seven users, that full-scale implementation of Senior Projects engenders significant cultural shifts. The winding down of a senior's career becomes a time for intellectual excitement rather than the inertia which is so often the case. Talents and skills essential to the workplace and professions, such as organizational and writing skills, time management, and presence before an audience, are elevated in this single operation to a higher level of visibility. The activity, in its anticipation as much as its reality, galvanizes diverse teachers and seniors, as well as juniors and administrators.

There is a reasonable prospect that North Carolina will require Senior Projects of all public schools. SERVE has already attained national recognition through presentations at ASCD meetings, the recognition of Panama City as a member of the ASCD assessment consortia, and selection of Panama City as the national site for ASCD'S 2001 assessment conference.

SERVE's School Development and Reform unit houses a variety of major initiatives which provide exemplary products and services: School Improvement, the CSRD, the Annual Forum, Improving Low Performing Schools, and the Delta Project (see above, pp.3-5).

SERVE's Early Childhood specialty area is guided by a reasonable process of quality controls. Initial foci, the product of a national assessment, has included teacher and caregiver training and preparation; quality childcare and education; linking of services; and access to and availability of quality care/education. These directions were reexamined during the mid-contract stage through another national assessment. Earlier themes remained, while such issues as assessment, retention, compensation, and financing were given added currency. The Early Childhood and School Improvement units appear to be collaborating effectively. The staff has disseminated widely a variety of documents of reasonable quality. Presentations are made at appropriate national meetings.

3. Areas of needed improvement

- There is a reasonable prospect that greater cross-pollination across programs would lead to even greater quality in program implementation.
- There is potential for each initiative to deliver effective services to a broader audience through publications in selected journals and presentations at more diverse national meetings.
- Staff of each major initiative should keep apprised of the best ideas of other SERVE initiatives.
- For each initiative greater attention should be given to data collection which measures student success.

3. Recommendations for improvement

- See #2 above.

IV. Utility

A. To what extent are the products and services provided by the Laboratory useful to and used by customers?

1. Strengths

There is considerable and consistent attention within SERVE to address customer needs within the region. This sentiment pervades all levels of the staff and reflects the commitment by the Board of Directors. The manifestations are varied and numerous. SERVE's current organizational structure reflects outcomes of the broadly interactive Delphi needs assessment process. Sentiments expressed by program managers, reflected in comments made during interviews with users, made clear SERVE's high level of sensitivity to both the perception and the substance of client responsiveness. Many of the initiatives in various states were catalyzed by specific requests by users to SERVE. The distributed organization and the on-site Policy Analysts are designed to provide intimate and timely reactions to customer requests and inquiries. The act of surveying participants at virtually all formal gatherings convened by SERVE, combined with the positive ratings which SERVE generally receives on these, reflects both the commitment and results of sensitivity to customer needs. These outcomes are all generated by the Lab operating with its users in a genuinely collaborative, interactive way (see also pp. 1-5).

2. Areas of needed improvement

Earlier recommendations focused on the need of SERVE to focus more attention on needs of its national customers (see pp. 1-5).

3. Recommendations for improvement

- See #2 above.

B. To what extent is the REL focused on customer needs?

See pp. 1-5, 12-17.

V. Outcomes and Impact

A. To what extent is the REL's work contributing to improved student success, particularly in intensive implementation sites?

1. Strengths

All of SERVE's initiatives may be viewed as contributing to student success. Only one, however, School Improvement, provided data which directly related reform impacts to elevations in student achievements. Even there, the issue of attribution was unclear. Part of the difficulty lies in the nature of SERVE's role and also in the nature of the reform initiatives. All of SERVE's major initiatives are based on collaboration with states, schools, districts, and communities: each of whom is involved in a spectrum of non-SERVE related reforms. Even if elevations in student achievement result, the issue of attribution would remain unclear. Some of SERVE's efforts, such as School Improvement, focus primarily on strengthening school planning; in this case there is no direct SERVE intervention in the teaching and learning process.

It does not appear that consistent and ongoing collection of student achievement data has been a priority for SERVE. Based on discussions with project staff, this will become a higher future priority in selected programs.

2. Areas of needed improvement

SERVE needs long-range strategies to collect data which measures student achievement. There does not need to be a rigid reliance on test data alone. Data emanating from Senior Projects, for example, could help illuminate some broad dimensions of student learning which

standardized testing does not capture. The Early Childhood initiative could profit from comparing the results of different interventions with baselines initially established.

3. Recommendations for improvement

B. To what extent does the Laboratory assist states and localities to implement comprehensive school improvement strategies?

1. Strengths

SERVE's varied systemic initiatives are uniquely adapted to assist states and localities. The Assessment, School Improvement, Early Childhood, and CSRD programs are all "whole school" efforts. In each of the six affected states there are major initiatives which have been implemented at the specific request of local authorities. SERVE's customer-friendly ambience, highlighted by an interactive approach which makes all participants learners, causes the organization to excel at working with schools and localities to implement comprehensive school reform. This finding was amply supported by survey results and all individuals interviewed, including teachers, administrators, state department representatives, other policymakers, and a few students.

The uniquely important and influential roles of Policy Analysts, among other initiatives, also provides considerable support to states and localities (see above, pp.1-5).

2. Areas of needed improvement

More attention should be given to the purposive selection of participating school and district sites to ensure variation in key demographic and contextual factors within SERVE implementation sites. It is clear that in many cases schools and districts were selected as SERVE implementation sites only because of their individual requests. One advantage of a more proactive recruitment and selection of sites within identified political and demographic

categories is that this could enhance understanding of the interventions which work and those which do not under varying local circumstances.

It is not entirely clear what “scaling up” means within the context of SERVE initiatives. There is considerable evidence that scaling up has been a marketing concept, attractively disseminating information and initiatives. Scaling up should reflect the engineering meaning, taking a prototype to large-scale production. Adopting the latter view could cause SERVE to engineer their reform product for greater portability.

3. Recommendations for improvement

Serve should select implementation sites in a more deliberate manner, to understand better the circumstances under which interventions are effective, and to engineer prototypes to facilitate upscaling.

More effective collaboration among programs is needed for the reasons stated above, and also to ensure that the best insights of one systemic program effectively informs the directions taken by one nearby.

C. To what extent has the REL made progress in establishing a regional and national reputation in its specialty area?

1. Strengths

There is considerable evidence that SERVE has established a reputation in those sections of the six-state region in which the Early Childhood unit has intervention programs. It is also clear that SERVE has disseminated Early Childhood documents regionwide and in some instances nationally. In collaboration with several other labs, SERVE also occupies a leadership role via the LNP in Early Childhood among the federal labs.

2. Areas of needed improvement

There are insufficient publications in national refereed journals for SERVE to have established a national reputation in the Early Childhood specialty.

3. Recommendations for improvement

To attain its stated vision of national leadership, and fulfill its obligations to OERI, SERVE's Early Childhood unit should publish more aggressively in national refereed journals.

VI. Overall Evaluation of Total Laboratory Programs, Products and Services

and

VII. Broad Summary of Strengths, Areas for Improvement, and Strategies for Improvement

SERVE is a young organization which is performing reasonably well and is positioned to perform at an even higher level. Some leadership difficulties over the past year appear to have been largely overcome. From all appearances the transitions have been relatively smooth. Staff appear to generally respect and work well together. The highly involved Board of Directors, along with other key stakeholders, have high regard for the staff and the work they do.

The Laboratory programs are the centripetal forces of SERVE, around which directions for the overall organization are charted. This perspective shapes statements of visions and goals as well as the day-to-day implementation of programs. Whether deciding on major directions, or the day-to-day implementation of key initiatives, SERVE is committed to fully engaging its customers in a continuous interactive manner. At the state, district, school, or individual participant level, a question posed is likely to be met by a prompt SERVE response. It may even be met by an initiative which is tailored largely to the customer's specifications. This would

certainly not be the case, of course, with the highly respected impartial work of the Policy Analysts; nor does it imply anything less than faithful observance of prescriptions embedded in respective programs. Nevertheless, the “customer is always right” view produces specially targeted initiatives in a variety of states, and an ambience of intimacy and concern that is reflected in genuine customer support for wide-ranging initiatives.

The customer may not always be right. It is unclear whether SERVE’s often uncritical responsiveness to local requests is always consistent with its commitments to the larger region and the nation. For example, SERVE supervises a variety of programs which serve primarily one or two states. Each of these, without question, addresses significant educational issues for that locale. This strategy provides stakeholders in each state with both the appearance and substance of SERVE’s commitments to their educational needs. Yet SERVE has the larger responsibility to promote and upscale systemic reform throughout the region and in select cases the nation. Would these larger responsibilities be more effectively served by establishing effective prototypes throughout the region of whole school reform as bases for upscaling? This premise appears central to both the conceptualization and SERVE’s implementation of the CSRD program; the implications could inform other efforts of SERVE as well.

SERVE’s quality assurance process ensures careful control of publications which represent SERVE’s face to its many constituencies. Along with many other features and processes of the organization, this process engages SERVE staff across programs in meaningful exchanges, resulting in the cross-pollination of ideas and in some cases highly successful internal collaborative efforts. The new organizational structure, which places disparate initiatives under supervision of a Deputy Executive Director, holds out the promise that even greater collaboration across programs will occur in the future. Nevertheless, this reviewer left with the abiding sense

that the institution has not valued the pooling of insights across major programs the same way SERVE values, for example, timely and genuine responsiveness to its local customers. One even wonders whether the high and admirable level of commitment to local customers de-emphasizes the values which should connect reform initiatives across various locales. In any case, institutional arrangements are needed to help ensure that the best ideas become common currency across programs. Since this involves cultural as well as procedural and perhaps organizational changes, this matter is a major challenge for SERVE's leadership.

In various ways SERVE has a presence on the national level. Through Early Childhood leadership within the LNP; the involvement in preparation and dissemination of some products which have had a broad national distribution, both within and beyond the labs, such as the assessment Toolkit; along with presentations at meetings of a variety of national organizations. Yet again, it is clear that SERVE's local orientation has resulted in insufficient emphasis being placed on serving its national customers.

SERVE masterly collects data considered important to its central operations, including: a database for dissemination of publications; data related to the 17-step process for quality assurance; data from surveys of virtually all formal activities which assist SERVE in fine tuning programs to customer needs; data related to a carefully implemented annual needs assessment process; and data related to customer interactions with various websites.

Some data, however, are studiously not collected. In only one instance, spanning interviews for many programs, was direct data presented related to student achievement. The absence of this data has various explanations. In many instances programs are young and the full impact on students is yet to be felt. In many instances the character of SERVE's involvement, such as the focus on planning through School Improvement, makes it inherently difficult to

attribute student results to SERVE's intervention. There were indications in some cases , including reading and Early Childhood, that more attention would be placed in the future on relations between SERVE's presence and attributes of student success. Yet none of these reasons constitute a sufficient rationale for failing to systematically collect data leading to evaluations that document reasons for successes and failures. While data regarding student test performance should be collected, baselines and "effects" do not need to be confined to traditional measures. Collection of relevant data is the prerequisite to developing effective prototypes and upscaling, a requirement in continuing formative and summative evaluations which shape directions for programs, and a growing responsibility simply in reporting consequences to customers.

SERVE should evaluate its major continuing program initiatives on a regular cycle, using external consultants, and appropriate data should be collected for this and broader purposes.

After five days of friendly conversations in Greensboro and perusing endless streams of carefully prepared documentation, the diligent, compassionate, and skilled SERVE staff are clearly making a positive educational difference within the affected southeastern states. This transitional stage in leadership should be a period of reflection to build upon that foundation, requiring neither sudden disruptions nor passive acquiescence. Instead it is an opportunity to critically revisit persisting assumptions to make certain that directions of the organization accord fully with its mission and goals. A considerable range of SERVE practices and choices deserve to be commended, expanded, and strengthened; other practices and choices deserve revisions and/or substitutions. The test of leadership will be to help make the choices which will make the appropriate difference.